

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biochemistry, Genetics and Molecular Biology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJBGMB_117493
Title of the Manuscript:	Biomolecular interactions of the phytoconstituents of <i>Nigella sativa</i> with anti-apoptotic proteins Mcl-1 and Bcl-x1.
Type of the Article	

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajbgmb.com/index.php/AJBGMB/editorial-policy>)

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- This computational study may have some importance to both pharmacology and bioinformatics fields as it assesses the potential activity of <i>Nigella sativa</i> against anti-apoptotic proteins. 2- Authors are advised to add the phrase "a computational modelling study" to manuscript title to indicates nature of study. 3- Yes, the abstract looks comprehensive. 4- Yes, this manuscript looks to be structured in the appropriate way. 5- Yes, this manuscript looks scientifically correct in general. 6- The used references are sufficient and recent. However, I suggest to give citation to both swissADME and Pro-Tox II web servers. 7- Authors should always write the scientific name of the herb in the appropriate style "italic". 8- For the keywords, authors should add "<i>Nigella sativa</i>". 9- In the introduction, authors should note that cancer positively (not negatively) impact oncogenes. 10- for the docking procedure, what was the grid box size and coordinates? What the authors means by terms like "prime" and "hydrogen repositioning"? What are the chemical names for co-crystalized ligands? 11- Authors should note that these screening compounds are considered hits and not lead. 	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? 	<p>Writing quality looks good.</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>		

[Review Form 1.7](#)

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Hasanain Abdulhameed Odhar
Department, University & Country	Al-Zahrawi University College, Iraq